



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,594	10/30/2001	Steven Klindworth	800621	6592

23372 7590 04/20/2004

TAYLOR RUSSELL & RUSSELL, P.C.
4807 SPICEWOOD SPRINGS ROAD
BUILDING ONE, SUITE 1200
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER

SENFI, BEHROOZ M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2613

3

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/016,594

Applicant(s)

KLINDWORTH, STEVEN

Examiner

Behrooz Senfi

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2001.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 7, 10 - 12, 14 – 18, 20, 22 – 23 and 25 - 26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants admitted prior art in view of Liu (US 6,369,699).

Regarding claims 1 and 14, Applicant's admitted prior art (i.e. fig. 1) teaches a surveillance security system for transferring audio and video and power between a remote source and a central processor and displaying. The prior art reference uses many cables (e.g. coaxial cable) for transferring audio and video and power. The prior art reference fails to teach using one single coaxial cable for transmitting the audio/video and power to remote source/location. However, such features are well known and used in the prior art of the record as evidenced by Liu '699 (i.e. fig. 1, col. 1, lines 34 – 35). Therefore, taking the combined teaching of applicant's admitted prior art and Liu '699 as a whole, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the admitted prior art reference and using one single coaxial cable as taught by Liu '699 for transferring audio/video and control and power signals over a single coaxial cable to improve and overcome the prior art defects of using plurality of cables (col. 1, lines 14 – 16 and 34 – 36 of Liu).

Regarding claim 2, the combination of the applicant admitted prior art (i.e. fig. 1) and Liu '699 teaches, "carrier signal and power over the single coaxial cable are transmitted simultaneously" (i.e. fig. 1 of Liu).

Regarding claim 3, combination of the applicant admitted prior art (i.e. fig. 1) and Liu '699 teaches, "combining the power and the modulated carrier and splitting the power and the modulated carrier in the remote location" (fig. 1, modulator 12 and demodulator 16 of Liu).

Regarding claims 4, combination of the applicant admitted prior art (i.e. fig. 1) and Liu '699 teaches, "displaying video component on the monitor and annunciating audio component on speaker" (fig. 1, prior art, 110 and 116).

Regarding claim 5, the limitation claimed are substantially similar to claim 1, therefore the grounds for rejecting claim 1 also apply here. Furthermore, as for the additional limitation "plurality of video and audio signals" please see (fig. 1, prior art, cameras 140 and microphones 130 of applicant).

Regarding claims 6 – 7, the limitations claimed are substantially similar to claims 4 – 5, therefore the grounds for rejecting claims 4 – 5 also apply here.

Regarding claims 10 – 11, combination of the applicant admitted prior art (i.e. fig. 1) and Liu '699 teaches the use of camera for generating audio/video signal. But fails to explicitly teach the use of "black and white camera". However the use of "black and white camera" is well known in the conventional art. Therefore, the use of a black and white camera would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention, to reduce the cost.

Regarding claim 12, combination of the applicant admitted prior art (i.e. fig. 1) and Liu '699 teaches, "modulating video signal in a camera and demodulating the carrier" (i.e. fig. 1, modulator 12 and demodulator 17 of Liu).

Regarding claims 15 - 17, combination of the applicant admitted prior art (i.e. fig. 1) and Liu '699 teaches "audio/video modulator" (i.e. fig. 1, modulator 12) and "demodulator in claim 16" (i.e. fig. 1, demodulator 17 of Liu) and "means for combining the power and the modulated carrier audio/video" (i.e. fig. 1 of Liu).

Regarding claims 18 and 20, the limitations claimed are substantially similar to claim 1, therefore, the grounds for rejecting claim 1 also applies here. As for the plurality of "video and audio" please see applicant cited prior art (i.e. fig. 1).

Regarding claim 22, combination of the applicant admitted prior art (i.e. fig. 1) and Liu '699 teaches, "a plurality of remotely located cameras" (i.e. fig. 1, cameras 140 of cited prior art by applicant) and "a plurality of remotely located microphone" (i.e. fig. 1, microphone 130 of cited prior art by applicant) and "audio/video processor connected to a video monitor" (i.e. fig. 1, audio/video 114, and monitor 110 of cited prior art by applicant) and "single coaxial cable" (i.e. fig. 1, cable 14 of Liu).

Regarding claim 23, combination of the applicant admitted prior art (i.e. fig. 1) and Liu '699 teaches, a surveillance system with remote camera source and central/local processor for bi-directional communication over a single coaxial cable between the remote camera and central processor, including external power supply and control switch and modulator and demodulator for combining the signal and sending over the cable. Therefore a converter for converting the camera's field of view to a video

Art Unit: 2613

signal for transferring over the cable and external microphone would have been obvious over combination teaching of applicant cited prior art (i.e. fig. 1) and Liu '699 reference.

3. Claims 8 and 19 is are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants admitted prior art in view of Liu (US 6,369,699) further in view of Suda (US 6,707,982).

Regarding claim 8 and 19, combination of the applicant admitted prior art (i.e. fig.1) and Liu '699 teaches, surveillance security system for transferring audio and video and power between a remote source and a central processor over a single coaxial cable and (i.e. fig. 1, col. 1, lines 34 – 35 of Liu) and control signal from a switch control device (Liu, col. 3, lines 40 – 42) and also power supply positioned near the camera (i.e. fig. 1, power supply 150 of the applicant cited prior art). The prior art fails to explicitly teach the switch for “selecting the power” as claimed. However, such feature is well known and used as evidenced by Suda '982 (i.e. fig. 8, power selection switch 804) Therefore, taking the combined teaching of applicant cited prior art and Liu '699 and Suda '982 as a whole, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teaching of the prior arts and use the selector switch as taught by Suda for the desired purpose.

4. Claims 9, 13, 21, 24 and 27 – 30, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants admitted prior art in view of Liu (US 6,369,699) further in view of Elberbaum (US 6,191,814).

Regarding claim 9, combination of the applicant admitted prior art (i.e. fig. 1) and

Art Unit: 2613

Liu '699 teaches, surveillance security system for transferring audio and video and power between a remote source and a central processor over a single coaxial cable and (i.e. fig. 1, col. 1, lines 34 – 35 of Liu) and control signal from a switch control device (Liu, col. 3, lines 40 – 42) and also power supply positioned near the camera (i.e. fig. 1, power supply 150 of the applicant cited prior art). The prior art fails to explicitly teach “selectively disabling power as claimed”. However, such feature is well known and used as evidenced by Elberbaum '814 (i.e. fig. 2, switch selector 30), Therefore, taking the combined teaching of applicant cited prior art and Liu '699 and Elberbaum '814 as a whole, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teaching of the prior arts and use the selector switch 30 as taught by Elberbaum '814 for independent selection of any input into any output including selecting the power (col. 9, lines 19 – 20 of Elberbaum).

Regarding claims 13 and 21, the limitations claimed are substantially similar to claim 9 with respect to claims 1 and 5, therefore the grounds for rejecting claim 9 also apply here.

Regarding claim 24, combination of the applicant admitted prior art (i.e. fig. 1) And Liu '699 teaches, “surveillance security system with plurality of receiver and plurality of microphone and video monitor and audio speaker and power supply” (i.e. fig. 1 of applicant cited prior art) and “single coaxial cable connected to the remote camera and local audio/video processor for carrying variety of signals” reads on Liu '699 (i.e. fig. 1). The combination of prior art references fails to explicitly teach, “selectively disabling power as claimed”. However, such feature is well known and used as

Art Unit: 2613

evidenced by Elberbaum '814 (i.e. fig. 2, switch selector 30), Therefore, taking the combined teaching of applicant cited prior art and Liu '699 and Elberbaum '814 as a whole, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teaching of the prior arts and use the selector switch 30 as taught by Elberbaum '814 for independent selection of any input into any output including selecting the power (col. 9, lines 19 – 20 of Elberbaum).

Regarding claim 25, combination of the applicant admitted prior art (i.e. fig. 1) and Liu '699 teaches audio/video processor for bi-directional transmission of audio/video and separating/splitting the modulated carrier signal through different frequency bands (i.e. col. 3, lines 49 – 65 of Liu) and the power supply for providing power. The power supply can be a AC power supply (col. 4, lines 11 – 12 of Liu and fig. 1, of cited prior art), therefore having a voltage regulator would have been obvious for regulating the output voltage of the AC power supply to the camera. It is noted that the applicant cited prior art and Liu fails to explicitly teach volume controller/adjustment for audio and also video adjustment. However video camera with audio and video (AGC) controller/adjustment capability is well known and used in the conventional art. Therefore, the use of a video camera with audio/video adjustment capability would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made in order for the user to be able to set and adjust the audio/video to the desired level. (Official notice)

Regarding claim 26, the limitations claimed "audio modulator input connected to the audio level adjustment and an audio modulator output connected to a frequency generator and frequency generator output connected to a mixer audio input, and video

modulator input connected to the video modulation adjustment and a video modulator output connected to an input of a video carrier generator" for transmission of audio/video over the single coaxial cable reads on applicant admitted prior art (i.e. fig. 1) and Liu '699 reference (i.e. fig. 1, modulator 12 and filter 13, abstract).

Regarding claims 27 - 28, combination of the applicant admitted prior art (i.e. fig. 1) and Liu '699 and Elberbaum '814 teaches, "camera/receiver connected to the coaxial cable" (i.e. fig. 1, of cited prior art and fig. 1, of Liu) and "power supply connected to the demodulator" (i.e. fig. 1, of Liu) and "filter connected to carrier signal" (i.e. fig. 1, of Liu) and "filter input connected to the combiner carrier and filter out put connected to demodulator" (i.e. fig. 1, of Liu) and "audio out put driver having an input connected to the output of a sound detector of the a audio/video demodulator and an output connected to an audio processing circuitry" reads on (fig. 1, of Liu) thus the demodulator 17, receive the modulated signals and separate the signal to audio and video and control signals and outputted. The combination of the prior art teaches transferring the signals through different frequency bands. But fails to explicitly teach IF stage prior to demodulation. However, the use of IF stage amplifier is well known in the art, in order to shift and receive signal of different frequency. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to utilize IF stage amplifier prior to demodulator for receiving the signal of different frequencies. (Official notice)

Regarding claims 29 - 30, combination teaching of applicant cited prior art and Liu '699 and Elberbaum '814 teaches, "processing circuitry generates a video monitor

Art Unit: 2613

signal for displaying the images on the monitor". (i.e. applicant cited prior art fig. 1, monitor 110).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Behrooz Senfi** whose telephone number is **(703)305-0132**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Chris Kelley** can be reached on **(703)305-4856**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relative to the status of the application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

B. S. B. P.

4/18/2004


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600